

Martha Guzman's Comments on the Stakeholder Briefing Document

- Chapter 2, California Water Today:
 - A) Page 2-3, "Existing Statewide Water Uses and Supplies," 1st paragraph, last sentence: In many rural areas, water quality a serious problem. The second sentence in the paragraph mentions water supply issues in rural communities during drought. In reality, water quality is a much bigger issue than water supply. This is an issue for about 90% of the communities in the Central Valley, Imperial Valley and Central Coast. NRDC did a study on groundwater quality in the State and might be a good source of information regarding this point.
 - B) Page 2-6: "Private Entities" this section doesn't mention desalination plants. Also a question that comes up regarding bond funds, is the issue of a gift of state to private entities to reduce costs. How do we provide public resources to a private entity to generate public goods? [See additional comment below, regarding "Funding Strategies" on page 6-11.]
 - C) Page 2-15: "Contamination of Surface and Groundwater is Limiting Supplies," talks about saltwater intrusion and salinity. Nitrates also limit drinking water supplies; mention nitrates in addition to salts.
 - D) Page 2-18: "Constraints on Inter-Regional Deliveries," brings up a good point. The next to last sentence talks about protecting public interests. Between the last two sentences, add a new sentence: "Especially when water management decisions are not made by the community as a whole." Decisions made by a few often fail to protect public interests.
- Chapter 3, Planning for an Uncertain Future:
 - A) Page 3-9, first bullet on farm labor availability, last two sentences should say: "Long term trends suggest increased access and higher nominal costs of hired farm labor. We expect current trends will continue and that labor availability will not be a limiting factor in the future, though nominal costs will rise" (Add the word nominal.)
 - B) Page 3-13, "Water Quality Concerns," last paragraph on interagency coordination and partnerships across watersheds. Don't know where it fits, but put in something about the need for integration of all water districts that provide irrigation water with communities in those districts. E.g. Tulare Irrigation District working with communities in that district on drinking water problems, putting together a plan to address that.
- Chapter 4, Regional Integrated Resource Planning:
 - A) Page 4-16, Recommendations: Add another recommendation, saying something like "Agencies and districts that provide irrigation water should develop Integrated Resource Planning with rural communities."
- Chapter 6, State Role and Financing the Plan:
 - A) Page 6-2 to 6-5, "Continuing State Role and Commitments" doesn't address groundwater. There needs to be a role for the State regarding monitoring or oversight of groundwater management. The recommendation could be made as a continuation of something already happening (e.g. encouraging the development of local groundwater management plans), or something stronger (e.g. the SWRCB should have jurisdiction over groundwater).
 - B) Page 6-11, "Funding Strategies." Maybe towards the end of page 6-12, bring up that the State needs to develop a policy to address "gift of state" prohibitions. In reality there are a lot of agencies supplying water, which as private entities aren't eligible for State funds (e.g. grant funding from propositions). The better we define when and how public dollars can be used by private entities, the more likely it is that water doesn't become a commodity.